UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/675,385	09/30/2003	Jeyhan Karaoguz	15013US02 6838	
	7590 09/08/200 R C WINSLADE	EXAMINER		
MCANDREWS HELD & MALLOY LTD 500 WEST MADISON ST 34TH FLOOR			RYAN, PATRICK A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
CHICAGO, IL	60661	2623		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			09/08/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/675,385	KARAOGUZ ET AL.		
F	A 4 11 14		
Examiner	Art Unit		

	PATRICK A. RYAN	2623	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appea	rs on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>25 August 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS API	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the application, applicant must timely file one of the following reapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appea for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CF periods:	ne same day as filing a Notice of plies: (1) an amendment, affidavi Il (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
 a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of the period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advance event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire late Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b) MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). 	visory Action, or (2) the date set forther than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date or have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exterunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the she set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later that may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	nsion and the corresponding amount ortened statutory period for reply original.	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complia filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extens Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS	ion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but (a) They raise new issues that would require further cons (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bette appeal; and/or	ideration and/or search (see NO`);	ΓE below);	
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a co NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			TOL 004)
 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _ 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowed. 			
non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)			
how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		The chiefed and an ex	manation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but I because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and s was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to ove showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary a	ercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		·	
 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but on See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (P 	, , , , ,	condition for allowan	ce because:
13. Other:	. 2,25,33,1 apai 110(3).		
/Scott Beliveau/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2623	/P. A. R./ Examiner, Art Unit 2623		

MISCELLANEOUS NOTE: APPLICANT IS ADVISED THAT THE EXAMINER OF RECORD FOR THIS APPLICATION HAS CHANGED.

Continuation of 11. Applicant's Reply to Final Office Action of June 25, 2008 ("Reply") does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

The Examiner upholds the rejection of the Claim 1 under 103(a) as being obvious over the combination of Cezeaux (US PGPUB 2002/0184631 A1) in view of Jaff (US PAT 7,281,261 B2) as addressed in the Final Office Action of June 25, 2008.

As stated in the Final Office Action Pages 2 to 4, Cezeaux is relied upon to teach the "providing one or both of payment and/or authorization information..." limitation (with reference to the interface of Figs. 3 and 4 and Paragraphs [0026,0029,0030,0034,0035]); and "receiving at a second location, said media from a storage location..." (with reference to Set-top Box 102 receiving media content from Content Sources 101 through Content Server 105, as shown in Fig. 1 and described in Paragraph [0030]). The Jaff reference is relied upon to teach "generating a request from a first location..." (with reference to Abstract; Figs. 1-3; col.2, lines 51-62; col.3, lines 11-18, col.6, lines 29-31, 52-57, col.7, lines 18-41; col.8, lines 25-28, 32-36; which describe the act of using an access device to program a set-top box from a location away from the set-top box location). In other words, this combination demonstrates a user at a remote access device "generating a request" (first location) for media by programming a set-top box for "receiving" media (second location) from a storage location.

The Examiner therefore upholds that the combination of Cezeaux and Jaff teach each limitation of Claim 1, as summarized above with further reference to Final Office Action Pages 2 to 4.